



THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appeal No: Unassigned

In re application of: NAKAMURA, Hisashi et al.

Group Art Unit: 2675

Serial Number: 10/073,959

Examiner: Srilakshmi K. KUMAR

Filed: February 14, 2002

Confirmation No.: 8711

For: LIQUID CRYSTAL PROJECTOR COOLING SYSTEM
DEPENDENT ON AIR PRESSURE AND TEMPERATURE
VARIABLES (AS AMENDED)

Customer Number: 38834

Attorney Docket No.: 042288

REPLY BRIEF

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

July 25, 2007

Sir:

This paper is filed in response to the Examiner's Answer filed June 11, 2007.

In the Examiner's Answer of June 11, 2007 it is stated that "applicant's argument that Sugawara fails to include three variables, temperature, control voltage and air pressure is... incorrect..." Appellant at no point has argued that Sugawara does not address all three variables. Appellant has claimed a control table which has a limitation of what is contained in that control table.

The limitation is the relationship of the temperature as detected by the temperature sensor and the value of a control voltage for the driving circuit of the cooling fan for each of a plurality of classes into which the outside air pressure is divided.

A reference, to anticipate this limitation must not simply address the same variable, but address them in the same fashion as they are limited to apply to one another.

As noted on page 6 of Appellant's brief, the control table must contain the relationship of the three variables wherein if the temperature is "x" and air pressure is "y", the control value (voltage) is "z". This is further limited by the next limitation wherein the means for determining the value of the control voltage on the basis of the control table.

The Examiner's Answer only refers to the determination of temperature compensation by Sugawara. Particularly, on pages 3-4 the Examiner states "...column 15, lines 15-19, Sugawara teaches the incorporation of all three variables in the determination of temperature compensation... Sugawara then continues to teach that temperature compensation T_0 can be created based on..." (emphasis added).

All of the Examiner's arguments rely on temperature compensation T_0 values. Again, as noted on page 6 of the Appeal Brief, Sugawara may utilize the same variables but not in the manner required by the claim limitation. Sugawara adjusts (compensates for) the temperature (*i.e.*, manipulates its value) based on air pressure. This is not anticipatory of the relevant limitation of claims 2 and 3.

In the present invention, the temperature value of the control table is not manipulated or compensated for by the detection of air pressure. The temperature is as detected by the sensor. It is applied separately from the air pressure to the control voltage by both the means in claim 2 and the circuit in claim 3. The temperature value as claimed is not manipulated prior to determining the control voltage.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No.: 10/073,959
Reply Brief filed July 25, 2007
Attorney Docket No.: 042288

Sugawara, as discussed on page 6 of the Appeal Brief discloses a table which manipulates temperature to derive a value T_c . See col. 8, line 63 to col. 9, line 3.

The new disclosure to which the Examiner refers in column 15 of Sugawara is not different. The disclosed relationship is still that within steps S10 and S11 to give the compensation-value T_0 , not the temperature.


Therefore, as stated in the Appeal Brief, Sugawara does not anticipate the present claims because it does not teach the control table wherein the temperature value detected by the temperature sensor is applied separately from the air pressure and the air pressure is likewise applied separately from the temperature to the control voltage. In Sugawara, air pressure is applied to the temperature to obtain a value which is then applied to voltage.

In conclusion, appellants submit that the arguments presented above and in the Appeal Brief justify the reversal of all pending rejections.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No.: 10/073,959
Reply Brief filed July 25, 2007
Attorney Docket No.: 042288

In the event this paper is not timely filed, appellants petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for any such extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866, along with any other additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP


Michael J. Caridi
Attorney for Appellants
Reg. No. 56,171

MJC